arXiv:0802.3455v5 [math.PR] 6 Aug 2008

# A Truncation Approach for Fast Computation of Distribution Functions [*]

Xinjia Chen

February, 2008

**Abstract**

In this paper, we propose a general approach for improving the efficiency of computing distribution functions. The idea is to truncate the domain of summation or integration.

## 1 General Theory

In various fields of sciences and engineering, it is a frequent problem to compute distribution functions. Specifically, it is desirable to compute efficiently and precisely the probability

$$P = \Pr\{a_i < X_i < b_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m\}$$

where $X_1, \cdots, X_m$ are random variables defined in probability space $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \Pr)$ and $a_i, \ b_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m$ are real numbers. Since the probability can be expressed as an $m$-dimensional summation or integration over domain

$$D = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_m) : a_i < x_i < b_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m\},$$

the computational complexity may depend on the size of $D$. In many situations, the larger the size of domain $D$ is, the more computation is required. Hence, it will be of computational advantage to reduce the domain $D$ as its subset

$$D' = \{(x_1, \cdots, x_m) : a'_i < x_i < b'_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m\}$$

such that

$$P' = \Pr\{a'_i < X_i < b'_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m\}$$

is close to $P$ within a controllable difference. For this purpose, we have

---

[*] The author is currently with Department of Electrical Engineering, Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, and Department of Electrical Engineering, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA 70813, USA; Email: chenxinjia@gmail.com

**Theorem 1** *Let* $u_i$, $v_i$, $\alpha_i$, $\beta_i$ *be real numbers such that*

$$\Pr\{X_i \leq u_i\} \leq \alpha_i, \qquad \Pr\{X_i \geq v_i\} \leq \beta_i$$

*for* $i = 1, \cdots, m$. *Let*

$$a_i' = \max(a_i, u_i), \qquad b_i' = \min(b_i, v_i), \qquad i = 1, \cdots, m.$$

*Then,*

$$P' \leq P \leq P' + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_i + \beta_i).$$

**Proof**. Obviously, $P' \leq P$ is true since $D'$ is a subset of $D$. Thus, it suffices to show $P \leq P' + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_i + \beta_i)$.

Note that

$$P' = \Pr\{a_i' < X_i < b_i', \ i = 1, \cdots, m\} = \Pr\{\cap_{i=1}^{m} (A_i \cap B_i) \cap C\}$$

where

$$A_i = \{X_i > u_i\}, \qquad B_i = \{X_i < v_i\}, \qquad i = 1, \cdots, m$$

and $C = \{a_i < X_i < b_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, m\}$. By Bonferroni's inequality,

$$\Pr\{\cap_{i=1}^{m} (A_i \cap B_i) \cap C\} \geq \Pr\{C\} - 2m + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\Pr\{A_i\} + \Pr\{B_i\}).$$

By the definitions of $P$ and $P'$,

$$P' \geq P - 2m + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\Pr\{A_i\} + \Pr\{B_i\}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P &\leq P' + 2m - \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\Pr\{A_i\} + \Pr\{B_i\}) \\ &= P' + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ (1 - \Pr\{A_i\}) + (1 - \Pr\{B_i\}) \right] \\ &= P' + \sum_{i=1}^{m} \left[ \Pr\{X_i \leq u_i\} + \Pr\{X_i \geq v_i\} \right] \\ &\leq P' + \sum_{i=1}^{m} (\alpha_i + \beta_i). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

□

To ensure that $P' \leq P \leq P' + \eta$ for a prescribed $\eta > 0$, it suffices to choose

$$\alpha_i = \beta_i = \frac{\eta}{2m}.$$

As can be seen from Theorem 1, a critical step is to determine $u$ and $v$ for a random variable $X$ such that

$$\Pr\{X \leq u\} \leq \alpha, \qquad \Pr\{X \geq v\} \leq \beta$$

for prescribed $\alpha,\ \beta \in (0, 1)$. For this purpose, we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 2** *Let $X$ be a random variable with mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$. Let*

$$\mathscr{C}(z) = \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}].$$

*Then the following statements hold true:*

*(I) For any $z > \mu$,*

$$\Pr\{X \geq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z).$$

*(II) For any $z < \mu$,*

$$\Pr\{X \leq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z).$$

*(III) Both $\mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta)$ and $\mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta)$ are monotonically decreasing with respect to $\Delta > 0$.*

*(IV) For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, there exists a unique $\Delta > 0$ such that $\mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta) = \alpha$.*

*(V) For any $\beta \in (0, 1)$, there exists a unique $\Delta > 0$ such that $\mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) = \beta$.*

**Proof**. By Jensen's inequality

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] \geq e^{t\mathbb{E}[X-z]}.$$

Hence, if $z < \mu$, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] \geq e^{t\mathbb{E}[X-z]} \geq 1$ for $t \geq 0$. Similarly, if $z > \mu$, we have $\mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] \geq e^{t\mathbb{E}[X-z]} \geq 1$ for $t \leq 0$. Combing these observations and the fact that

$$0 \leq \mathscr{C}(z) \leq \mathbb{E}[e^{0 \times (X-z)}] = 1,$$

we have

$$\mathscr{C}(z) = \begin{cases} \inf_{t<0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] & \text{for } z < \mu, \\ \inf_{t>0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] & \text{for } z > \mu. \end{cases}$$

By the Chernoff bounds [1],

$$\Pr\{X \geq z\} \leq \inf_{t<0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] = \mathscr{C}(z)$$

for $z < \mu$; and

$$\Pr\{X \leq z\} \leq \inf_{t>0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-z)}] = \mathscr{C}(z)$$

for $z > \mu$. This completes the proof of statements (I) and (II).

To show that $\mathscr{C}(\mu+\mathit{\Delta})$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\mathit{\Delta} > 0$, let $t_{\mathit{\Delta}}$ be the number such that

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}].$$

Then, $t_{\mathit{\Delta}}$ is positive and

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}} = 0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mathscr{C}(\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}{d\mathit{\Delta}} &= \frac{d\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{d\mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{d\ \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{d\mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}} \frac{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} + 0 \times \frac{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, to show that $\mathscr{C}(\mu-\mathit{\Delta})$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\mathit{\Delta} > 0$, let $t_{\mathit{\Delta}}$ be the number such that

$$\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}].$$

Then, $t_{\mathit{\Delta}}$ is negative and

$$\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}} = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\mathscr{C}(\mu-\mathit{\Delta})}{d\mathit{\Delta}} &= \frac{d\inf_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{d\mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{d\ \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{d\mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} + \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}} \frac{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} + 0 \times \frac{\partial t_{\mathit{\Delta}}}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} \\
&= \frac{\partial \mathbb{E}[e^{t_{\mathit{\Delta}}(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}]}{\partial \mathit{\Delta}} < 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of statements (III).

To show statement (IV), note that

$$\liminf_{\mathit{\Delta}\to 0} \mathscr{C}(\mu-\mathit{\Delta}) = \liminf_{\mathit{\Delta}\to 0} \inf_{t<0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})}] \geq \liminf_{\mathit{\Delta}\to 0} \inf_{t<0} e^{\mathbb{E}[t(X-\mu+\mathit{\Delta})]} = \lim_{\mathit{\Delta}\to 0} \inf_{t<0} e^{\mathit{\Delta} t} = 1 \tag{1}$$

and that

$$\lim_{\mathit{\Delta}\to\infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu-\mathit{\Delta}) = 0 \tag{2}$$

as a result of

$$\liminf_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta) \geq 0$$

and

$$\limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta) = \limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \inf_{t<0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu+\Delta)}] \leq \limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{-(X-\mu+\Delta)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{-(X-\mu)}] \lim_{\Delta \to \infty} e^{-\Delta} = 0.$$

Hence, (IV) follows from (1), (2) and the fact that $\mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\Delta > 0$.

To show statement (V), note that

$$\liminf_{\Delta \to 0} \mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) = \liminf_{\Delta \to 0} \inf_{t>0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu-\Delta)}] \geq \liminf_{\Delta \to 0} \inf_{t>0} e^{\mathbb{E}[t(X-\mu-\Delta)]} = \lim_{\Delta \to 0} \inf_{t>0} e^{-\Delta t} = 1 \tag{3}$$

and that

$$\lim_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) = 0 \tag{4}$$

as a result of

$$\liminf_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) \geq 0$$

and

$$\limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) = \limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \inf_{t>0} \mathbb{E}[e^{t(X-\mu-\Delta)}] \leq \limsup_{\Delta \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[e^{(X-\mu-\Delta)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{(X-\mu)}] \lim_{\Delta \to \infty} e^{-\Delta} = 0.$$

Hence, (V) follows from (3), (4) and the fact that $\mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\Delta > 0$.

□

As can be seen from Theorem 2, since $\mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\Delta > 0$, we can determine $\Delta > 0$ such that $\mathscr{C}(\mu - \Delta) = \alpha$ by a bisection search. Then, setting $u = \mu - \Delta$ yields $\Pr\{X \leq u\} \leq \alpha$ as desired. Similarly, we can determine $\Delta > 0$ such that $\mathscr{C}(\mu + \Delta) = \beta$ by a bisection search and set $v = \mu + \Delta$ to ensure $\Pr\{X \geq v\} \leq \beta$.

## 2 Applications

The approach of reducing the domain $D$ to its subset $D'$ is referred to as *truncation technique* in this paper. By the Chebyshev's inequality, it can be visualized that if the variances of $X_i$ are small, then the size of the truncated domain $D'$ can be much smaller than that of domain $D$, even though $\eta$ is extremely small.

For the truncation technique to be of practical use, it is desirable that functions $\mathscr{C}(z)$ associated $X_i$ have closed form. This is indeed the case for many important distributions. For example, when $X$ is the average of i.i.d Bernoulli random variables $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$ such that $\Pr\{Y_i = 1\} = p$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, the Hoeffding's inequality [2] asserts that

$$\Pr\{X \geq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z), \qquad \forall z > p$$

$$\Pr\{X \leq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z), \qquad \forall z < p$$

where

$$\mathscr{C}(z) = \left[ \left(\frac{p}{z}\right)^{z} \left(\frac{1-p}{1-z}\right)^{1-z} \right]^{n}.$$

For another example, when $X$ is the average of i.i.d Poisson random variables $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$ such that $\mathbb{E}\{Y_i = 1\} = \lambda$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, it can be shown by the Chernoff bounds [1] that

$$\Pr\{X \geq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z), \qquad \forall z > \lambda$$

$$\Pr\{X \leq z\} \leq \mathscr{C}(z), \qquad \forall z < \lambda$$

where

$$\mathscr{C}(z) = \left[ e^{-\lambda} \left(\frac{\lambda e}{z}\right)^{z} \right]^{n}.$$

Similar truncation techniques can be developed for hypergeometric distribution, negative binomial distribution, hypergeometric waiting-time distribution, etc.

In the case that simple and tight bounds of $\mathscr{C}(z)$ are available, it is convenient to use the bounds in the truncation of $D$. In this regard, we have established the following result.

**Theorem 3** *Let $K$ be a binomial random variable such that $\Pr\{K = i\} = \binom{n}{i} p^i (1-p)^{n-i}, \ i = 0, 1, \cdots, n$ where $p \in (0,1)$ and $n$ is a positive integer. Then, for arbitrary real numbers $a$, $b$ and any $\eta \in (0,1)$,*

$$\Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} \leq \Pr\{a \leq K \leq b\} < \Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} + \eta$$

*where*

$$\mathrm{T}^- = \max\left\{ a, \ \left\lceil np + \frac{1 - 2p - \sqrt{1 + \frac{18np(1-p)}{\ln \frac{2}{\eta}}}}{\frac{2}{3n} + \frac{3}{\ln \frac{2}{\eta}}} \right\rceil \right\}, \quad \mathrm{T}^+ = \min\left\{ b, \ \left\lfloor np + \frac{1 - 2p + \sqrt{1 + \frac{18np(1-p)}{\ln \frac{2}{\eta}}}}{\frac{2}{3n} + \frac{3}{\ln \frac{2}{\eta}}} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

*with $\lfloor . \rfloor$ and $\lceil . \rceil$ denoting the floor and ceiling functions respectively.*

We would like to remark that $\mathrm{T}^+ - \mathrm{T}^-$ can be much smaller than $b - a$ even though $\eta$ is chosen as an extremely small positive number.

To prove Theorem 3, we need some preliminary results.

**Lemma 1** *Define $\mathscr{M}(z, \mu) = \frac{(\mu - z)^2}{2\left(\frac{2\mu}{3} + \frac{z}{3}\right)\left(\frac{2\mu}{3} + \frac{z}{3} - 1\right)}$ for $0 < \mu < 1$ and $-2\mu < z < 3 - 2\mu$. Then, for any fixed $\mu \in (0,1)$, $\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing from $-\infty$ to $0$ as $z$ increases from $-2\mu$ to $\mu$, and is monotonically decreasing from $0$ to $-\infty$ as $z$ increases from $\mu$ to $3 - 2\mu$.*

**Proof**. After a lengthy calculation, we obtained

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}(z,\mu)}{\partial z} = \frac{(\mu - z)\, w(z,\mu)}{\left[\left(\frac{2\mu}{3} + \frac{z}{3}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2\mu}{3} - \frac{z}{3}\right)\right]^2}$$

where $w(z,\mu) = \mu(1 - \frac{2\mu}{3} - \frac{z}{3}) + \frac{z-\mu}{6}$. Noting that $w(-2\mu,\mu) = \frac{\mu}{2} > 0$, $w(\mu,\mu) = \mu(1-\mu) > 0$ and that $w(z,\mu)$ is linear with respect to $z$, we have that $w(z,\mu) > 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$ and $z \in (-2\mu,\mu)$. It follows that $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}(z,\mu)}{\partial z} > 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$ and $z \in (-2\mu,\mu)$. In view of the positive sign of the partial derivative and the fact that $\lim_{z \to -2\mu} \mathscr{M}(z,\mu) = -\infty$, $\mathscr{M}(\mu,\mu) = 0$, we have that, for any fixed $\mu \in (0,1)$, $\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)$ is monotonically increasing from $-\infty$ to 0 as $z$ increases from $-2\mu$ to $\mu$.

Similarly, observing that $w(3-2\mu,\mu) = \frac{1-\mu}{2} > 0$, $w(\mu,\mu) = \mu(1-\mu) > 0$ and that $w(z,\mu)$ is linear with respect to $z$, we have that $w(z,\mu) > 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$ and $z \in (\mu, 3-2\mu)$. Consequently, $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}(z,\mu)}{\partial z} < 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$ and $z \in (\mu, 3-2\mu)$. In view of the negative sign of the partial derivative and the fact that $\lim_{z \to 3-2\mu} \mathscr{M}(z,\mu) = -\infty$, $\mathscr{M}(\mu,\mu) = 0$, we have that, for any fixed $\mu \in (0,1)$, $\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)$ is monotonically decreasing from 0 to $-\infty$ as $z$ increases from $\mu$ to $3-2\mu$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

The following lemma is a slight variation of Theorem 2 at page 1271 of [3], which was obtained by Massart as a byproduct in determining the tight constant in the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality.

**Lemma 2** *Let* $\overline{X}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ *where* $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ *are i.i.d. random variables such that* $0 \leq X_i \leq 1$ *and* $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu \in (0,1)$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, n$. *Then,* $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)\right)$ *for any* $z \in (\mu, 1)$.

We can extend Lemma 2 as follows.

**Lemma 3** *Let* $\overline{X}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ *where* $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ *are i.i.d. random variables such that* $0 \leq X_i \leq 1$ *and* $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu \in (0,1)$ *for* $i = 1, \cdots, n$. *Then,* $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)\right)$ *for any* $z \in (\mu, 3-2\mu)$. *Similarly,* $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)\right)$ *for any* $z \in (-2\mu, \mu)$.

**Proof**. To show $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z,\mu)\right)$ for any $z \in (\mu, 3-2\mu)$, we shall consider three cases: (i) $z \in (\mu,1)$; (ii) $z = 1$; (iii) $z \in (1, 3-2\mu)$.

In Case (i), the statement has been established as Lemma 2.

In Case (ii), we have $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} = \Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n = 1\right\} = \prod_{i=1}^n \Pr\{X_i = 1\} \leq \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu^n$. We claim that $\ln(\mu) < \mathscr{M}(1,\mu)$. To prove this claim, it suffices to show $\ln(\mu) < \frac{9(\mu-1)}{4(2\mu+1)}$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$, since $\mathscr{M}(1,\mu) = \frac{9(\mu-1)}{4(2\mu+1)}$. For simplicity of notation, define $g(\mu) = \ln(\mu) - \frac{9(\mu-1)}{4(2\mu+1)}$. Then, the first derivative of $g(\mu)$ with respect to $\mu$ is $g'(\mu) = \frac{5\mu^2+4-11\mu(1-\mu)}{4\mu(2\mu+1)^2} \geq \frac{5\mu^2+4-11\times\frac{1}{4}}{4\mu(2\mu+1)^2} > 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$. This implies that $g(\mu)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $\mu \in (0,1)$. By virtue of such monotonicity and the fact that $g(1) = 0$, we can conclude that $g(\mu) < 0$ for any $\mu \in (0,1)$.

This establishes our claim that $\ln(\mu) < \mathscr{M}(1, \mu)$. It follows that $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ holds for $z = 1$.

In Case (iii), since $0 \leq \overline{X}_n \leq 1$, we have $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \geq z\right\} = 0 < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ for $z \in (1, 3-2\mu)$.

To show $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ for any $z \in (-2\mu, \mu)$, we shall consider three cases as follows.

In the case of $z \in (0, \mu)$, we define $y = 1-z$ and $\overline{Y}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n Y_i}{n}$ with $Y_i = 1-X_i$ for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then, $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} = \Pr\left\{\overline{Y}_n \geq y\right\}$. Applying Lemma 2 to i.i.d. random variables $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$, we have $\Pr\left\{\overline{Y}_n \geq y\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(y, 1-\mu)\right) = \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ for $1-\mu < y < 1$, i.e., $0 < z < \mu$. This shows that $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ holds for $z \in (0, \mu)$.

In the case of $z = 0$, we have $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} = \Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n = 0\right\} = \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \Pr\{X_i \neq 0\}) \leq \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - \mathbb{E}[X_i]) = (1-\mu)^n$. We claim that $\ln(1-\mu) < \mathscr{M}(0, \mu)$. To prove this claim, it suffices to show $\ln(1-\mu) < \frac{9\mu}{4(2\mu-3)}$ for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$, since $\mathscr{M}(0, \mu) = \frac{9\mu}{4(2\mu-3)}$. For simplicity of notation, define $h(\mu) = \ln(1-\mu) - \frac{9\mu}{4(2\mu-3)}$. Then, the first derivative of $h(\mu)$ with respect to $\mu$ is $h'(\mu) = \frac{-16\mu^2+21\mu-9}{4(1-\mu)(2\mu-3)^2} \leq \frac{16\times(\frac{21}{32})^2-9}{4(1-\mu)(2\mu-3)^2} < 0$ for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$. This implies that $h(\mu)$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $\mu \in (0, 1)$. By virtue of such monotonicity and the fact that $h(0) = 0$, we can conclude that $h(\mu) < 0$ for any $\mu \in (0, 1)$. This establishes our claim that $\ln(1-\mu) < \mathscr{M}(0, \mu)$. It follows that $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ holds for $z = 0$.

In the case of $z \in (-2\mu, 0)$, since $0 \leq \overline{X}_n \leq 1$, we have $\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n \leq z\right\} = 0 < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, \mu)\right)$ for $z \in (-2\mu, 0)$.

This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

Now we are in a position to prove Theorem 3. By Lemma 1, we have that, for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$, there exist two real numbers $z_1 \in (-2p, p)$ and $z_2 \in (p, 3-2p)$ such that $\exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z_1, p)\right) = \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z_2, p)\right) = \frac{\eta}{2}$. Observing that $\exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z, p)\right) = \frac{\eta}{2}$ can be transformed into a quadratic equation with respect to $z$, we can obtain explicit expressions for $z_1$ and $z_2$ as

$$z_1 = p + \frac{1 - 2p - \sqrt{1 + \frac{18np(1-p)}{\ln\frac{2}{\eta}}}}{\frac{2}{3} + \frac{3n}{\ln\frac{2}{\eta}}}, \qquad z_2 = p + \frac{1 - 2p + \sqrt{1 + \frac{18np(1-p)}{\ln\frac{2}{\eta}}}}{\frac{2}{3} + \frac{3n}{\ln\frac{2}{\eta}}}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 3, we have

$$\Pr\{K \leq nz_1\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z_1, p)\right) = \frac{\eta}{2}, \qquad \Pr\{K \geq nz_2\} < \exp\left(n\mathscr{M}(z_2, p)\right) = \frac{\eta}{2}$$

and

$$\mathrm{T}^- = \max\left\{a,\ \lceil nz_1 \rceil\right\}, \qquad \mathrm{T}^+ = \min\left\{b,\ \lfloor nz_2 \rfloor\right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\Pr\{K > \lfloor nz_2 \rfloor\} = \Pr\{K \geq \lfloor nz_2 \rfloor + 1\} \leq \Pr\{K > nz_2\} \leq \Pr\{K \geq nz_2\} < \frac{\eta}{2},$$

$$\Pr\{K < \lceil nz_1 \rceil\} = \Pr\{K \leq \lceil nz_1 \rceil - 1\} \leq \Pr\{K < nz_1\} \leq \Pr\{K \leq nz_1\} < \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

Since

$$\Pr\{a \leq K \leq b\} \leq \Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} + \Pr\{\mathrm{T}^+ < K \leq b\} + \Pr\{a \leq K < \mathrm{T}^-\}$$

and

$$\Pr\{\mathrm{T}^+ < K \leq b\} \leq \Pr\{K > \lfloor n z_2 \rfloor\}, \qquad \Pr\{a \leq K < \mathrm{T}^-\} \leq \Pr\{K < \lceil n z_1 \rceil\},$$

we have

$$\Pr\{a \leq K \leq b\} < \Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} + \frac{\eta}{2} + \frac{\eta}{2} = \Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} + \eta.$$

On the other hand, $\Pr\{\mathrm{T}^- \leq K \leq \mathrm{T}^+\} \leq \Pr\{a \leq K \leq b\}$ is trivially true. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

# References

[1] Chernoff, H. (1952). A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **23** 493–507.

[2] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded variables. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **58** 13–29.

[3] Massart, P. (1990). The tight constant in the Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz inequality. *The Annals of Probability*, **18** 1269–1283.